


REMARKS

1. The examiner objected to the abstract because it contained two paragraphs. The applicants have requested an amendment deleting the second paragraph.
- 2,3. The examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, stating the format for definition of R is unclear. The applicants have requested an amendment rewording the definition of R to be selected from the group consisting of substituted monovalent hydrocarbon groups and unsubstituted monovalent hydrocarbon groups.
4. The examiner objected to the disclosure because an informal symbol (%) was used to represent the word "percent." The applicants have requested an amendment replacing the symbol with the word.
- 5,6. The examiner rejected claims 1,2,4,5,10,11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C.102(b) as being anticipated by Kunieda et al. Applicants respectfully point out that Kunieda et al. teach an organosilane limited to an OH-terminated organosilane represented by the general formula



wherein R^1 and R^2 , which may be the same or different, are each n unsubstituted or substituted monovalent hydrocarbon group, at least one of which is

phenyl, m is an integer of 1 to 20, and n in an integer from 0 to 20. The applicants respectfully point out that in fact for the formula of Kunieda to be an organosilane, and not an organosiloxane, n in the above formula is zero.

The applicants have limited claim 1 to two groups of silanes, methoxysilanes and ethoxysilanes. These organosilanes are exemplified by the methoxy and ethoxy silanes listed on page 5, lines 8-14 of the specification. The applicants have further added claim 17, which specifically claims the methoxy silanes and ethoxy silanes on page 5, lines 8-14. The applicants respectfully point out that the organosilane of Kunieda does not include the use of methoxy or ethoxy silanes.

Based on the above, the applicants respectfully request removal of this ground for rejection.

7. The examiner rejected Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 10 and 12 to 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Azechi. The applicants have amended their claims to limit the claimed invention to those cured by organoperoxide catalysts. Because the compositions of Azechi et al. do not include an organoperoxide catalyst, they do not anticipate the present claims. Based on this, the applicants respectfully request removal of this ground for rejection.

8,9. The examiner rejected Claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunieda or Azechi in view of Onishi. The examiner states that Onishi, in column 6, lines 6-67 and in column 7, lines 1-6 teaches it is standard


practice to treat inorganic fillers such as aluminum hydroxide when used in silicone rubber compositions.

The applicants respectfully point out that aluminum hydroxide is one of several inorganic fillers which Onishi lists generically as an optional component, and that Onishi does not provide any guidance for how to select one of these inorganic fillers for improving electrical insulating properties. Nothing in Onishi would lead one to use of a treated aluminum hydroxide in a composition with 100 weight parts polyorganosiloxane comprising at least 2 silicon bonded alkenyl groups in each molecule and having average compositional formula $R_aSiO_{(4-a)/2}$, and an organoperoxide curing agent to form the electrical insulating composition claimed. The applicants point out that the differences shown in properties after water immersion shown in the examples of compositions containing treated aluminum hydroxide in the examples compared to the composition of the comparison example would not be expected based on the teaching of the art cited. For example, referring to Table 1, after 100 hours in water, the volume resistivity of the comparative example dropped by three orders of magnitude from 1.9×10^{14} to 2.4×10^{10} . The examples, containing treated ATH, however, had very minor decreases in volume resistivity. Based on these unexpected results, the applicants request the removal of these grounds for rejection.

SUMMARY

Based on the above amendments and discussion, the applicant respectfully request that the examiner withdraw rejection of the remaining claims, and allow the amended claims, with new claim 17 to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Jennifer S. Warren
Registration number 41,522
Dow Corning Corporation
Patent Department -- Mail C01232
Midland MI 48686-0994
(517) 496-5392